

REMARKS

The Applicant thanks the Examiner for the thorough consideration given the present application. Claims 22 and 25 were previously canceled. Claims 1-21, 23, 24, and 26-47 are pending. Claims 1, 13, 21 and 24 are amended, and claim 47 is added. Claims 1, 13, 21, 24, and 47 are independent. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein.

Drawings

It is gratefully appreciated that the Examiner has accepted the drawings.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) and §103(a)

Claims 1, 2, 13, 14, and 37-40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Kawasaki (U.S. 4,619,476);

claims 3-7, 15-19, and 36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawasaki;

claims 12, 21, 23, 24, 26-35, and 41-46 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawasaki in view of Lin (U.S. 2004/0026949 A1), and further in view of Bettin et al. (U.S. 6,533,339); and

claims 8-11 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawasaki in view of Lin, and further in view of Lemmen (U.S. 6,062, 623).

These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Amendments to Independent Claims 1, 13, 21, and 24

While not conceding the appropriateness of the Examiner's rejection, but merely to advance prosecution of the instant application, each of independent claims 1, 13, 21, and 24 is amended herein to recite a combination of elements directed to a structure of a storage system, including *inter alia*

a peripheral indent that is shallower than said storage indent and formed throughout an entire periphery of the opening of the storage indent.

Support for the novel features set forth in each of independent claims 1, 13, 21, and 24 can be seen, for example, in FIGS. 2-4, 7-10, and 13.

The Examiner argues in the Final Office Action that Kawasaki (US 4,619,476) discloses "the peripheral indent" by the portion indicated as 15f (of Fig. 4). However, the portion 15f of Kawasaki is not formed to surround the entire periphery of the opening. The portion 15f is merely "an upper edge 15f of the opening edge 15e" (column 4, line 15 of Kawasaki). In Kawasaki, the sealing mechanism of the present invention cannot be achieved.

In addition, as can be seen in Lin FIGS. 1 and 3, this document merely discloses an indent that is NOT formed throughout an entire periphery of the opening.

Further, the Bettin et al. document fails to disclose a "peripheral indent" as set forth in independent claims 1, 13, 21 and 24.

The Applicant respectfully submits that none of the cited references disclose the "peripheral indent formed throughout an entire periphery of the opening" of the amended

independent claims 1, 13, 21 and 24. Therefore, independent claims 1, 13, 21 and 24 and the claims depending therefrom are allowable.

At least for the reasons above, the Applicant respectfully submits that the references cited by the Examiner, including Kawasaki, Lin, and Bettin et al., fail to teach or suggest the combination of elements set forth in each of independent claims 1, 13, 21, and 24.

Therefore, independent claims 1, 13, 21, and 24 are in condition for allowance.

Added Independent Claim 47

The Examiner will note that independent claim 47 has been added to recite a combination of elements directed to a structure of a storage section including *inter alia*

a first dividing wall portion ... ;

a second dividing wall portion ... ; and

a surround indent portion formed between the first dividing wall portion and the second dividing wall portion.

Support for the above features can be found in the specification, for example, in paragraph [0070]. See also FIGS. 10 and 11.

In contrast to the present invention, as can be seen in Kawasaki FIG. 3, this document fails to disclose a surround indent portion formed between the first dividing wall portion and the second dividing wall portion.

Therefore, independent claim 47 is in condition for allowance.

Dependent Claims

All dependent claims are in condition for allowance due to their dependency from allowable independent claims, or due to the additional novel features set forth therein.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) and §103(a) are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

Since the remaining patents cited by the Examiner have not been utilized to reject claims, but merely to show the state of the art, no comment need be made with respect thereto.

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and that the present application is in condition for allowance.


If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, he is invited to telephone Carl T. Thomsen (Reg. No. 50,786) at (703) 205-8000.

Application No. 10/815,755
Amendment dated July 5, 2006
Reply to Office Action of April 5, 2006

Docket No. 0649-1006PUS1
Art Unit: 3612
Page 19 of 19

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17, particularly extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By 
James M. Slattery, Reg. No. 28,380
P. O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000

JMS/CTT/gf 